NEW YORK JOURNAL AND ADVERTISER. | AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. W. R. HEARST

CONSULT ONE WHO KNOWS.

With Admiral Dewey's visit to Washington to-morrow our situation in the Philippines ought to enter upon a new phase. When the parades and the fireworks and the sword presentation and the speeches are over, let us hope that President McKinley will have sufficient wisdom to take Dewey into a private room, lock the door, set out a box of cigars and say:

"Now, between ourselves, Admiral, how are things going in the Philippines?"

"What is Otis doing?"

"How does he measure up to the demands of the occasion?"

"What is the real inside of this war?"

"Did we have to fight, or could we have avoided it?"

"Is it possible to conciliate the natives now, or must we thrash them into loving us?"

"Is Otis on good terms with his officers and men?"

"Are his operations well planned to produce decisive results?"

"Are the army and navy working well together?"

"What progress is being made toward establishing a civil government?"

"How effective is our occupation of the country, as far as it has gone?"

"What impression are we making on foreign observers at Manila and Hong Kong?"

"How are we regarded by the people of other tribes than the Tagalos?"

"What do you think of the censorship?"

An hour's talk of that sort with Dewey would give the President more enlightenment than a year's correspondence with Otis over the cable.

The people have borne the exasperating conditions in the Philippines with extraordinary patience. This patience has been due in large measure to their knowledge of the fact that Dewey was coming home. They have been willing to wait for the supreme authority on Philippine affairs to tell what ought to be d Now that he is here, they demand that his wisdom be utilized.

It is generally understood that General Otis and Admiral Dewey differed radically from the firs to the proper way of dealing with our responsibilities in the archipelago that was won for us by the n victory over Montojo's fleet. It is known that Otis has been jealous of the navy, for the Admiral has so. What the country wants to know now is how far the Otis policy has sacrificed our interests and dela the restoration of peace.

It has been possible for the Administration to ignore the protests of the correspondents, to sl the recommendations of the civilian Peace Commissioners, to shut its ears to the criticisms of disin ested foreign observers, and to dismiss the unanimous denunciations of the returning volunteers as complaints of "skulkers and riff-raff." But it will not be possible for it to ignore George Dewey.

Congress will meet in two months, and then all the facts will have to come out. Perhaps, by she force of numbers, and by the energy of subordinate commanders whom he has not been able to suppres General Otis may have succeeded by that time in crushing the Philippine insurrection and reducing t people of the islands to a sullen subjection to a hated foreign rule. But the public opinion of the United States will not be satisfied with that if it finds that peace could have been secured earlier, without the sac rifice of precious lives, and without a legacy of hate, by the exercise of such qualities as every American commander ought to possess.

If the President has any sense of political expediency he will welcome Dewey's arrival as an oppor tunity to extricate himself from a predicament that is daily becoming more embarrassing and that threatens speedily to become disastrous. He will discuss the situation frankly, and will accept the Admiral's advice in good faith. In that way he may be able to cut loose from some of the responsibility for the blunders of Otis, to the incalculable benefit of his political prospects.

LET DEWEY TAKE A REST.

Would it not be well after this celebration is over and after the "captains and the kings depart" to let Dewey alone for a brief spell, in order that he may brush the powder smoke from his eyes and breathe again the odors of the morning glories around his old Vermont home?

This grabbing at the hero of Manila for pecuniary and political purposes is nothing short of indecent.

Chicago wails aloud that if Dewey does not attend her festival it will prove a failure.

Boston wants him on October 9, with a lurking idea of using him to further an anti-expansion boom.

Most indecent of all is Mark Hanna, who wants Admiral Dewey to accompany President McKinley as far West as San Francisco on a political stumping tour.

The attempted dragging of Dewey into McKinley politics before he has fairly got rid of his sea legs is disgraceful.

The financial statesman of Ohio opposed the Spanish war and forced McKinley to oppose it until the people threatened to run away with the war chariot. Then Hanna seized the tailboard and lifted McKinley in.

Now that Dewey is being honored throughout the country, Hanna again leads McKinley forward and tries to prevail upon Dewey to become a train-platform exhibit for party purposes.

Dewey deserves a rest. Let him take it.

HISTORY MAKING WITH A RUSH.

The return of Admiral Dewey is an impressive reminder of the rapidity with which history has been made of late. It is less than two years since Dewey went to Asia. It was some time after that before the Journal formulated its National Policy, of things desirable for this country to accomplish. Before Dewey came back every item of that policy had been either carried out or put in the way of speedy achievement.

The Journal said: "Annex Hawaii," and Hawaii has been annexed. It called for "A Mighty Navy," and our navy has become one of the mightiest in the world. It demanded "Strategic Bases in the West Indies," and Porto Rico is ours and Cuba occupied. It said; "Dig the Nicaragua Canal," and the canal about to be dug. It advocated "Great National Universities at West Point and Annapolis," and the wo of enlargement has already been begun.

All this has been accomplished in the little time since Dewey went away. Now that he is at hon he may see the Journal's Internal Policy carried out as well. The world moves swiftly when it ge started.

On the Right to Kill the Sick. By Ambrose Bierce.

"IT is a physician's mission to cure disease and alleviate suffering. There is a point beyond which he cannot cure disease. After that it is his duty to alleviate suffering."

A mission implies a mandate, a mandate an authority superior to that of the missionary. I do not know from what higher authority a physician derives his own, nor who has the right to lay down the lines within which his activity must lie. Within the civil and the moral law Dr. Nehemiah Nickerson, whose words are quoted above, is a free agent—free to observe or disregard the customs of his trade as conscience may determine. He has no mandate, no mission.

It is true, however, that to "cure disease" and "alleviate suffering" are purposes commonly recognized as important among those belonging to the practice of medicine. Having failed to accomplish the first, how far may a physician go in accomplishing the second? That is a question that finds no answer in any imaginary "mandate." It is not even answered by the Decalogue, for the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" has so many obvious and necessary limitations that its value as a guide to conduct is virtually nothing. Dr. Nickerson believes he may go so far as to kill the patient that he cannot cure. Moreover, he candidly affirms his habit of doing so. We are told that he is an eminent physician; there is apparently nothing in his frank avowal to lessen his distinction. It would not surprise, indeed, if his fame should take attention from even the officers of the law. To make himself an object of lively interest in quarters where the several kinds of eminence in his profession are commonly overlooked he has only to descend from generals to particulars, naming the patients whom he has turned out of the frying pan of physical pain into whatever state awaited them, and the means (under Providence) which is employed to that end.

A man may be the best judge of what he is for, but by laymen unskilled in physic it is usually held that a person's "mission" is not only to "cure disease" and "alleviate suffering," but to prolong life—to save it altogether being impossible, for all must eventually die. But laymen have no mandate to be always right; now and again they have been in error. On the whole, there seems to be enough of plausibility in Dr. Nickerson's view to justify an examination. When a horse or a dog incurs the mischance of a broken back no question is raised as to the propriety of "putting it out of its misery." Unable to cure it, we kill it, and in doing so feel a comfortable sense of benevolence—a consciousness of having performed a disagreeable duty—of having discharged an obligation inseparable from our domination over the beasts of the field. It may be said that in the instance of a human being similarly incurable the dominion is lacking. But that does not go to the root of the matter, and is, moreover, untrue; for a helpless man is as much subject to our power as a helpless animal, and as much a charge upon our good will. And in many cases he is as little capable of deciding wisely what is good for him. A wounded bird or squirrel will manifest a strong indisposition to be "put out of its misery" by struggling to escape into the brush; a man will sometimes beg for death, even when he does not know himself incurable. If there should be a difference in the treatment of men and animals in respect of the matter in hand, it would seem from such facts as this that the beast should be spared and the man killed.

But Dr. Nickerson's critics think that a different rule—the present one—should hold, because the man is an immortal soul, whereas the beast is a thing of to-day, divinely ordained to "perish."

To this it may be said in reply: "All the stronger reason for a reversal of our practice; for in putting the man out of his misery you would not really kill, but only change him; but the animal, having only one life, in taking that you make him 'poor indeed,' depriving him of all that he has." That the man is an immortal soul is, however, a proposition which, after centuries of discussion, remains unsettled; and those who hold Dr. Nickerson's view must in conscience forego the advantage of the argument which their generous opponents try to thrust upon them. If we actually knew human beings to be immortal many of the current popular objections to killing them would disappear, and not only soldiers, but physicians and assassins, could work at their trades—with a comparatively free hand, along lines of usefulness not always and entirely divergent. Surely there could be no great wrong in "removing" a good Christian, whether he were ill at ease or not; to translate him from this vale of tears to the shining altitudes of Paradise is distinctly to augment the sum of human happiness. For that matter, it would not be difficult to demonstrate logically the proposition that every Christian may rightly slay every other Christian upon whom he can get his hands. True, he is forbidden by his religion to do so. All the more noble and generous of him to incur eternal punishment in order to abridge his brother's season of earthly trial, insure him against backsliding, and usher him at once into the Kingdom of Delights. In point of mere expediency a general observance of such high duty is open to the objection that it would somewhat reduce the church militant in point of numerical strength. But this is perhaps a digression.

It is urged that, not knowing the purposes of the Creator in creating and giving us life, we should endure (and make our helpless friends endure) whatever ills befall, lest by death we ignorantly frustrate the divine plan. Merely pausing to remark that the plan of an omnipotent Deity is probably not easily frustrated, I should like to point out that in this very ignorance of the purpose of existence lies a justification of putting an end to it. I did not ask for existence; it was thrust upon me without my assent. As He who gave it has permitted it to become an affliction to me, and has not apprised me of its advantages to others or to Himself, I am not bound to assume that it has any such advantages. If when in my despair I ask why I ought to continue a life of suffering I am uncivilly denied an answer, I am not bound to believe, and in lack of light may be unable to believe, that the answer if given would satisfy me. So, the game having gone against me and the dice appearing to be loaded, I ma That is the probably re pain. I con fallacious ne it seems to fling the di calls in a ph more obvious that than the an understan from God li a divine in one thinkin death would submission t of medicine The right with it the ri curably ill; f ourselves we in our care. medical advoc occasionally, a opportunity s ness is no less vey of the en deal easier to than his disloy higher sentime the people of

What the Pulitzer Scholarships Have Accomplished.

AN admirable expression of the democratic ideal in education is in Joseph Pulitzer's Free Scholarships. The ambitious schoolboys whose parents are poor place their hopes in them; all sincere students are interested in them.

Before Mr. Pulitzer initiated them, ten years ago, pupils in the public school class evoked images of vials in which the teachers poured science, and the adverse critics said, "It is as if it were necessary that physicians and cobblers should know the same things."

Mr. Pulitzer had a retort to that prepared. He wrote: "My special object is to help the poor. The rich can help themselves. My injunction against favoritism must, therefore, be understood as admitting of favoritism to the poor. I believe in self-made men, but it is not the aim of this plan to help people for ordinary money-making purposes. College education is not needed for that. There are nobler purposes in life, and my hope is not that these scholarships will make better butchers, bakers, brokers and bank cashiers, but that they will help to make teachers, scholars, physicians, authors, journalists, judges, lawyers and statesmen.

"They certainly ought to increase, not diminish, the number of those who, under our free institutions, rise from the humblest to the highest positions. I have not entered upon this scheme without careful thought. It was a dream of my youth. It is the conviction of experience.

"I shall be happy indeed if it should, even to the smallest degree, relieve poverty, aid the cause of education and lift into a higher plane of citizenship and usefulness to the State, children of the poor, who, in spite of talent, without such education and great hardship, cannot compete for the nobler prizes of an intellectual career."

The scheme, detailed to the City Superintendent of Schools in a letter, dated May 21, 1889, was to give to twelve boys—chosen among the graduates of the grammar schools—$250 a year each, during their five years' course in the College of the City of New York, or in any other college that a committee designated.

The graduate of the grammar school went to college, developed his general knowledge, acquired the perception of his particular faculties, of his individuality, and found himself incapable—in the lack of money, in the lack of ability to earn money—helpless at the threshold of his career.

The remedy was applied immediately. Mr. Pulitzer gave an endowment fund of $100,000 to Columbia University. By the terms of it ten elect among the grammar school graduates receive free tuition in the preparatory high school and the collegiate courses of the university every year.

The preparatory studies are in the Horace Mann school. They take three or four years, in the course of which each elect under the scholarship received $750. At the end of it he may go to a college that he has chosen and receive $250 a year, or enter Columbia University—the School of Arts, Mines or Law—and receive free tuition, besides $250 a year.

Since 1893 this new system of Joseph Pulitzer's free scholarships has been in triumphal operation. A committee composed of W. H. Merrill, representing Mr. Pulitzer; Virgil Prettyman, principal of the Horace Mann High School, and Joseph J. Kittel, member of the Board of Education, has the task of selecting the candidates.

They are restricted to 10 per cent of the graduating class in each school. One hundred and fifty were assembled in the Horace Mann High School in the first week of last June for examination. The subjects were English—grammar, composition and literature—American history, geography and arithmetic. The examiners question the candidates in view of their individual traits.

Twenty pupils are chosen. Then the secretary to the committee has the task of eliminating from the list those who are least in need of the free scholarships. Their founder intends that they shall be always the apanage of the poorest. The verification is extremely difficult. It implies learning, assiduity, refinement of tact. F. N. R. Martinez has these qualities intensely. Of his experience, he says:

"As a rule, the information obtained from the parents of a candidate is trustworthy. Often a father's self-interest or a mother's anxiety leads a family into exaggeration of its poverty. But the checks are so numerous and so sure! The twenty families are carefully questioned, the report of all the investigations is exhaustive. The committee selects by vote the ten elect to the free scholarship."

They were am to be lawyers, physicians, engineers; were in peril of becoming tailors i tshops, day laborers, dissatisfied hange n the grand army of the insignificant. ved air and life, and the social amenitie had the perspective of dark, damp roo owded tenements. They were pariahs re raised into the light, among thei s. Mr. Martinez says:

"The entire nun applicants have been serious boys determined, full of enthusiasm an They have won prizes and class thletic phases of leaders in the so n, physically and college life. They morally, healthy, in a word, good citizens."

Joseph Pulitzer holarships are a triumph of the ideal in educa tion. NE DU BOIS.